REMARKS

Claims 1-25 and 32-42 are now pending in this application. Claims 26-31 have been canceled by this amendment. Each of the pending claims is believed to define an invention that is novel and unobvious over the cited references. Favorable reconsideration of this case is respectfully requested.

Applicant's representative appreciates the Examiner conducting a personal interview in this case. During the interview, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 was discussed. Applicant's representative explained that the claims are tied to a specific environment, such as a native computer system. Additionally, the patentability of the claims over U.S. Patent Number 6,820,125 to Dingman et al. was discussed. Applicant's representative explained that the claimed invention relates to data that is converted from a foreign format to a native format and a then edited using a native system. Changes made using the native system are then made directly to the data in the foreign format. Dingman et al. does not teach or suggest at least this claimed feature. Dingman et al. only describes transforming data from a source in a source format to a target in a target format. In Dingman et al., any changes made to the source data are reflected in the target data via a transformation, not by directly changing the target data.

Claims 15, 16, 19-21 have been objected to due to various informalities. Independent claim 11 includes a step d) "directly making the tracked changes ... ". Each of dependent claims 15, 16, 19, 20 and 21 depend directly or indirectly from claim 11 and properly refer to step d) recited in claim 11. Although these claims depend indirectly depend from claim 11, the Applicant respectfully submits that it is proper to refer to the label step "d)" in the base claim. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the claimed objection.

Claim 7 has been objected to under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Independent claim 1 has been amended, which amendments make the subject matter of claim 7 more clear. Claim 1 recites that the editing is performed on the second data. First data is then altered to reflect changes made to the second data by the editing process. Dependent claim 7 further limits claim 1 by stating that altering step is performed after editing is complete. Claim 1 does not limit when the altering step is performed. In claim 1, the altering step may be run as a background process while a user is editing the data. In view of these amendments, it is respectfully submitted

that all pending claims are in all aspects in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Therefore, the withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 11 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101. Each of claims 1, 11 and 25 have been recited to recite that the editing is performed using a native computer system. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are directed to statutory subject matter and that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-42 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,820,135 to Dingman et al. Dingman et al. do not anticipate the present invention as it does not describe, among other things, altering data in a foreign format independently of a conversion process to reflect changes made to the data while edited in a native format.

In an exemplary embodiment of the invention, a method and system for preserving data translated or converted between different formats is provided. Assume a user of native system desires to work with a foreign file containing data in a foreign format. To do so, the foreign file in the foreign format should be converted into a native file in the native format. The conversion of the data into the native format allows the data to be manipulative, edited, changed, etc. by the native system. Any alterations made to the data using the native system may be tracked. The foreign file can then be modified to reflect these alterations by directly changing the foreign file rather than by attempting to recreate the foreign file from the altered or edited native file. That is, instead of converting the edited, native file back to a second foreign file, the changes are made directly to the foreign file.

For example, as recited in claim 11, a first set of data in a foreign format is converted into a second set of data in a native format used by the native system. The second set of data may then be edited using the native system. The first set of data in the foreign format is then altered to reflect the changes made to the second set of data. This altering is performed independently of any conversion process, as is recited in claim 1. As such, data that is not representable in the native format may be preserved, please see the present specification pages 7-8.

In comparison, Dingman et al. do not describe directly altering a first set of data in a foreign format to reflect changes made to a second set of data in a second format independent of any conversion process. Dingman et al. describe a system and method for event data transformation.

As shown in Figure 2 of Dingman et al., data from a source 124 may be transformed by a transformation engine 110 into data target 134. When the data pass through the transformation engine 110, the data is manipulated into the specified output format. Dingman et al. describes using a transformation to convert between the different data formats. As such, any changes made to the target data would pass through the transformation process and be represented in a second source file that represents the changed data. This is opposite of the invention recited in the claims. In Dingman, if a change is made to a target file, the transformation engine will convert the target data into a second set of source data including the revised data. This is similar to the prior art process described at page 2, line 7 – page 9, line 15 of the present specification. Dingman et al. do not teach or disclose directly altering the first source file.

In view of the above, it is clear that the cited reference does not disclose each and every element of the recited claims as is required by 35 U.S.C. 102. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner is of the opinion that the prosecution of this application would be advanced by a personal interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee necessitated by this Amendment to our Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 2, 2005   Respectfully submitted,

                                                 By_____
                                                 Jeffri A. Kaminski
                                                    Registration No.: 42,709
                                                 VENABLE LLP
                                                 P.O. Box 34385
                                                 Washington, DC 20043-9998
                                                 (202) 344-4000
                                                 (202) 344-8300 (Fax)
                                                 Attorney/Agent For Applicant